UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/595,143	03/03/2006	Jonathan R. Matias	PSG0101PUSA	3137
22045 BROOKS KUS	7590 01/26/201 HMAN P.C.	EXAMINER		
1000 TOWN C	ENTER	LEVY, NEIL S		
TWENTY-SEC SOUTHFIELD:			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1615	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/26/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Applic	ation No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/595	5,143	MATIAS, JONATHAN	۱R.			
		Exami	ner	Art Unit				
		NEIL L	EVY	1615				
	The MAILING DATE of this communic	ation appears on	the cover sheet with the	correspondence addre	ess			
Period fo	• •							
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failui Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FO HEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MA Isions of time may be available under the provisions of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this commu period for reply is specified above, the maximum statu- re to reply within the set or extended period for reply we eply received by the Office later than three months afted patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ILING DATE OF 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no nication. utory period will apply an ill, by statute, cause the	THIS COMMUNICATIO o event, however, may a reply be tid d will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from application to become ABANDONI	N. imely filed in the mailing date of this comn ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1) ズ	Responsive to communication(s) filed	on 12 January 2	010.					
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		o)⊠ This action i						
=								
	closed in accordance with the practice	e under <i>Ex parte</i>	Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	·53 O.G. 213.				
Dispositi	on of Claims							
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the ap	plication.						
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>6,9,10 and 13-22</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠	Claim(s) 1-5,7,8 and 11 is/are rejected	d.						
7)🛛	Claim(s) <u>12</u> is/are objected to.							
8)🖂	Claim(s) 1-22 are subject to restriction	n and/or election	requirement.					
Applicati	on Papers							
9)□ .	The specification is objected to by the	Examiner.						
,	10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 3/3/06 is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.							
,	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) 🔲 .	Acknowledgment is made of a claim fo	or foreign priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a	a)-(d) or (f).				
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:								
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No								
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage								
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).								
* S	see the attached detailed Office action	for a list of the ce	ertified copies not receiv	ed.				
Attachment			🗖					
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PT	O-948)	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail D					
3) 🔯 Inforn	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date 10/31/06.	o 040)	5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/595,143 Page 2

Art Unit: 1615

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's election without traverse of Group I species Holloysite, human, integument and mosquito in the reply filed on 1/12/2010 is acknowledged.

Claims 6, 9, 10, 13-22 stand withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected inventions and species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 1/5/2010

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-4, 5, 7, 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for menthol propyleneglycol-carbonate as a repellant, does not reasonably provide enablement for the generic formula of claim 1 as repellant. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to practice the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Only menthol propyleneglycol-carbonate is shown effective as a repellant.

The factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirement of 38 U. S. C. 112, the first paragraph have been described inn re Wands, 8 USPQ2D 1400 (Fed Cir. 1988). Among these factors are (1) the nature of the invention; (2) the state of the prior art; (3) the relative skill of those in the art; (4) the predictability or unpredictability of the art; (5) the breadth of the claims. (6) the amount of direction or guidance presented; (7) the presence

or absence of working examples; and (8) the quantity of experimentation necessary. When the above factors are weighed, it is the examiner's position that instant disclosure fails to meet the enablement requirement for the following reasons:

- (1) The nature of the invention: claims are to unqualified repellent efficacy.
- (2) The state of the prior art shows the use of these compounds for specific functions.
- (3) The relative skill of those in the art. The relative skill of those in the art is high.
- (4) The predictability or unpredictability of the art. The unpredictability of the art is very high.
- (5) The breadth of the claims. The claims are very broad, as repellency is claimed by any of the variations of formula of claim 1 against any of the over 640,000 insect species, applied in any locale or environment.
- (6) The amount of direction or guidance presented. They are limited to menthol propyleneglycol-carbonate against mosquitoes on people.
- (8) The quantity of experimentation necessary is extensive-there is no known levels of amount useful for any specific agent against any specific organism shown to exhibit repellency, except menthol propyleneglycol-carbonate against mosquitoes on people.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by MATIAS US 2002/0023044

A compound of formula of instant claim 1 (v) at page 4 [0051] is applied in sustained release carriers-paints [0052] .

Claim1, 7, 8, 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by TAMARKIN et al US 2005/0069566

See [0134-0141] insect repellants, including terpenoid esters and alcohols of the instant claim 1 formula are applied with carrier for extended protection to human integument [0142-0143].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim1-3, 7-8, 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MEYER et al 6696490

The instant compound of claim 1, a fatty acid ester of C8-30 with at least one hydroxyl group (column 3, lines 11-40) and with a substituted branch chain at the instant R is an insect repellant applied to human integument in a suitable carrier (column 3, lines 46-67). Long term effects are seen with carrier used (column 10, last paragraph). The carrier constitutes 1-99% of the formulation; by subtraction, 99-1% of the active would be present.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made desiring to utilize pest control means, to use MEYER , selecting the optimal form of the ester to maximize repellancy & modified as desired to increase stability, dispersibility, compatability of ingredients, processing ease, toxicity to handlers.

Page 5

All the critical elements of the instant are disclosed. amounts and proportions of each ingredient are result effective parameters chosen to obtain the desired effects. It would be obvious to vary the form of each ingredient to optimize the effect desired, depending upon the particular species and application method of interest, reduction of toxicity, cost minimization, enhanced, and prolonged, or synergistic effects.

Applicant has not provided any objective evidence of criticality, nonobvious or unexpected results that the administration of the particular compound or concentrations provides any greater or different level of prior art expectation as claimed, and the use of ingredient for the functionality for which they are known to be used is not basis for patentability.

Application/Control Number: 10/595,143 Page 6

Art Unit: 1615

The instant invention provides well known old art recognized compounds, with well known art recognized effects, applied by well known art recognized methods to achieve improved control as is well known in the art.

Claim 12 IS objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NEIL LEVY whose telephone number is 571-272-0619. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday, 7 AM to 5:30 PM EST..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, ROBERT A. WAX can be reached on 571-272-0623. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/595,143 Page 7

Art Unit: 1615

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/NEIL LEVY/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1615

1/12/2010